

How does baryon magnetic moment relate to its spin structure

Xiang-Song Chen, Di Qing, and Fan Wang

Department of Physics and Center for Theoretical Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China
(February 1, 2008)

A model independent, field theoretical relation between baryon magnetic moment and its spin structure is derived and it is explained why constituent quark model is a good approximation in describing baryon magnetic moments.

PACS numbers: 13.40.Em, 14.20.Dh

Baryon magnetic moment is closely related to its spin structure. In nonrelativistic quark model, ground state baryons are usually assumed to be in pure s -wave and baryon magnetic moment is solely due to quark spin contribution. By assuming constituent quark behaving as a Dirac quark, i.e., keeping the simple relation between quark spin $\vec{\sigma}$ and magnetic moment $\vec{\mu} = \frac{Q}{2m}\vec{\sigma}$, then adopting only two parameters of constituent quark masses $m_u=m_d=330\text{MeV}$, $m_s=560\text{MeV}$, the SU(6) quark model explains all measured baryon magnetic moments better than 20%. This has been a cornerstone of constituent quark model but never has a direct QCD explanation. Since 1988, polarized lepton-nucleon deep inelastic scattering (DIS) measurements have challenged our understanding of nucleon spin structure obtained from constituent quark model. Quark spin seems only contributes a small amount ($\leq 30\%$) of nucleon spin [1]. Thus it becomes even harder to explain the success of constituent quark model in predicting baryon magnetic moments. And we naturally have to find out how we can understand baryon magnetic moments with the newly discovered nucleon spin structure.

In previous studies, some authors [2,3] found that baryon magnetic moments can be fitted with the spin structure discovered in polarized DIS as well as or even better than in the naive quark model. In this paper, we will start from relativistic quantum field theory and derive a complete, model independent relation between baryon magnetic moment and its spin content, then explain from this field theoretical relation why constituent quark model is a good approximation at the problem of baryon magnetic moments.

We are acquainted with the relation between magnetic moment and spin, orbital angular momentum in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics:

$$\vec{\mu} = \frac{Q}{m}\vec{S} + \frac{Q}{2m}\vec{L}. \quad (1)$$

In relativistic quantum field theory, baryon magnetic moment is defined through its interacting with a static external magnetic field $\vec{B}$ (with four vector $\vec{A} = \frac{1}{2}\vec{B} \times \vec{x}$, $A^0 = 0$):

$$\begin{aligned} H_I &= \left\langle B \left| \sum_q -iQ_q \int d^3x \bar{\psi}_q \gamma^\mu \psi_q A_\mu \right| B \right\rangle \\ &\equiv -\langle B | \vec{\mu} | B \rangle \cdot \vec{B}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where color indices are implicit, $|B\rangle$ denotes the baryon state, and the magnetic moment operator can be straightforwardly shown to be

$$\vec{\mu} = \sum_q \vec{\mu}_q = \sum_q \frac{Q_q}{2} \int d^3x \psi_q^\dagger \vec{x} \times \vec{\alpha} \psi_q. \quad (3)$$

To find the relation between baryon magnetic moment and its spin structure, we expand $\psi(x)$ in terms of Dirac spinors. We must keep in mind that we are now dealing with quarks interacting with gluons, therefore we can not expand $\psi(x)$ in a free manner, but we can still expand it at a given time (say $t=0$) as:

$$\psi_q(x) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^3} \sum_\lambda \int d^3k \left(a_{q\vec{k}\lambda} u_{\vec{k}\lambda} e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} + b_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^\dagger v_{\vec{k}\lambda} e^{-i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} \right). \quad (4)$$

Insert eq.(4) into eq.(3) and after some algebras, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{\mu}_q = & \sum_{\lambda} \int d^3k \frac{Q_q}{2k_0} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} i\vec{\partial}_k \times \vec{k} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda} \\
& - \sum_{\lambda} \int d^3k \frac{Q_q}{2k_0} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} i\vec{\partial}_k \times \vec{k} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda} \\
& + \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \frac{Q_q}{2k_0} \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \vec{\sigma} \chi_{\lambda'} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda'} \\
& + \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \frac{Q_q}{2k_0} \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \vec{\sigma} \chi_{\lambda'} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda'}^{\dagger} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda} \\
& - \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \frac{Q_q}{2k_0} \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \frac{\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k}}{2k_0(k_0 + m_q)} i\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{k} \chi_{\lambda'} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda'} \\
& - \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \frac{Q_q}{2k_0} \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \frac{\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k}}{2k_0(k_0 + m_q)} i\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{k} \chi_{\lambda'} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda'}^{\dagger} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda} \\
& - \sum_{\lambda} \int d^3k \frac{Q_q}{2k_0} \frac{\vec{k}}{2(k_0 + m_q)} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} b_{q-\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} + h.c. \\
& + \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \frac{Q_q}{2k_0} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} i\vec{\partial}_k b_{q-\vec{k}\lambda'}^{\dagger} \times \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \left(m_q \vec{\sigma} + \frac{\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k}}{k_0 + m_q} i\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{k} \right) \chi_{\lambda'} + h.c.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Now we see that the first two terms are almost the standard forms of orbital magnetic moment in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics expressed in momentum space, except that the static quark mass m_q is now replaced by the relativistic quark energy k_0 . The third and fourth terms (where χ_{λ} denotes the Pauli spinor) also resemble the expression of spin magnetic moment in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics, with again the static quark mass replaced by the relativistic quark energy. However, compared with eq.(1), we have four more terms: the fifth and sixth terms are relativistic corrections; and the last two terms are quark-antiquark pair creation and annihilation terms which are characteristic of quantum field theory and only contribute to baryon magnetic moments when sea quark excitation mixing is included in baryon ground states.

Eq.(5) is not yet the final expression we aimed at, since the first four terms correspond to the orbital and spin contributions in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics, while in quantum chromodynamics, the quark spin and orbital angular momentum operators are

$$\vec{S}q = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \bar{\psi}_q \vec{\gamma} \gamma^5 \psi_q, \tag{6}$$

$$\vec{L}q = \int d^3x \psi_q^{\dagger} \vec{x} \times \frac{1}{i} \vec{\partial} \psi_q. \tag{7}$$

Again insert eq.(4) into them and transit to the momentum space, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{S}q = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \left(\vec{\sigma} - \frac{\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k}}{k_0(k_0 + m_q)} i\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{k} \right) \chi_{\lambda'} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda'} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \left(\vec{\sigma} - \frac{\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k}}{k_0(k_0 + m_q)} i\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{k} \right) \chi_{\lambda'} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda'}^{\dagger} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda} \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \frac{i\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{k}}{k_0} \chi_{\lambda'} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} b_{q-\vec{k}\lambda'}^{\dagger} + h.c. \\
\equiv & \int d^3k \vec{S}_{q\vec{k}} + \int d^3k \vec{S}_{\bar{q}\vec{k}} + \text{pair creation (annihilation) term} \\
\equiv & \vec{S}_q + \vec{S}_{\bar{q}} + \text{pair creation (annihilation) term},
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

$$\vec{L}q = \int d^3k \left(\sum_{\lambda} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} i\vec{\partial}_k \times \vec{k} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda} + \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \frac{\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k}}{2k_0(k_0 + m_q)} i\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{k} \chi_{\lambda'} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda'} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int d^3k \left(\sum_{\lambda} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} i\vec{\sigma}_k \times \vec{k} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda} - \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \frac{\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k}}{2k_0(k_0 + m_q)} i\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{k} \chi_{\lambda'} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda'}^{\dagger} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda} \right) \\
& - \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \frac{i\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{k}}{2k_0} \chi_{\lambda'} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} b_{q-\vec{k}\lambda'}^{\dagger} + h.c. \\
& \equiv \int d^3k \vec{L}_{q\vec{k}} + \int d^3k \vec{L}_{\bar{q}\vec{k}} + \text{pair terms} \\
& \equiv \vec{L}_q + \vec{L}_{\bar{q}} + \text{pair terms.}
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Now compare eqs.(5), (8) and (9), we find that the magnetic moment operator in relativistic quantum field theory can be expressed in a quite elegant form which is exactly analogous to our notion of magnetic moment in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics except for the additional quark-antiquark pair creation (annihilation) term:

$$\vec{\mu}_q = \int d^3k \frac{Q_q}{k_0} (\vec{S}_{q\vec{k}} - \vec{S}_{\bar{q}\vec{k}}) + \int d^3k \frac{Q_q}{2k_0} (\vec{L}_{q\vec{k}} - \vec{L}_{\bar{q}\vec{k}}) + \text{pair terms.} \tag{10}$$

Applying this operator to baryon ground states as shown in eq.(2) and approximating the $\frac{1}{k_0}$ factors by the average value of relativistic quark energy inside the baryon, we can express baryon magnetic moment in the language of baryon spin structure:

$$\mu_B = \sum_q \frac{Q_q}{2\langle k_0 \rangle_q} (\Delta_q - \Delta_{\bar{q}} + L_q - L_{\bar{q}}) + \text{pair terms,} \tag{11}$$

where L_q ($L_{\bar{q}}$) denotes the quark (antiquark) orbital contribution to the baryon spin, and Δ_q ($\Delta_{\bar{q}}$) represents the proportion of baryon spin carried by quark (antiquark) spin or helicity.

Eqs. (10) and (11) are elegant by their forms and physical interpretations. However, $L_q - L_{\bar{q}}$ has less direct experimental significance. In the following we will make use of the measurable baryon tensor charge and rearrange eq.(5) into more practical expressions.

Baryon tensor charge δq is defined through

$$\left\langle PS \left| \int d^3x \bar{\psi}_q \sigma^{\mu\nu} \psi_q \right| PS \right\rangle = \bar{u}_{PS} \sigma^{\mu\nu} u_{PS} \cdot \delta q. \tag{12}$$

It has received an increasing amount of attention after it was shown by Jaffe and Ji that it can be related to the first moment of quark transversity distribution $h_1(x)$ measured in transversely polarized scattering experiments [4]. For our purpose we consider a baryon at rest and polarized along the third direction, in which case $\delta q = \langle PS | (\vec{\delta q})_3 | PS \rangle$, with

$$\vec{\delta q} = \int d^3x \bar{\psi}_q \vec{\Sigma} \psi_q. \tag{13}$$

Insert eq.(4) into eq. (13), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{\delta q} &= \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \left(\frac{m_q}{k_0} \vec{\sigma} + \frac{\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k}}{k_0(k_0 + m_q)} i\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{k} \right) \chi_{\lambda'} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda'} \\
&+ \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \chi_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \left(\frac{m_q}{k_0} \vec{\sigma} + \frac{\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k}}{k_0(k_0 + m_q)} i\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{k} \right) \chi_{\lambda'} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda'}^{\dagger} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda} \\
&- \sum_{\lambda} \int d^3k \frac{\vec{k}}{k_0} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} b_{q-\vec{k}\lambda}^{\dagger} + h.c. \\
&\equiv \vec{\delta}_q - \vec{\delta}_{\bar{q}} + \text{pair terms.}
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Compare eqs. (5), (8), and (14), and also approximate $\frac{1}{k_0}$ factors by the average value of relativistic quark energy inside the baryon, we see that baryon magnetic moment can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{\mu} = & \sum_q \frac{Q_q}{2 \langle k_0 \rangle_q} \left(\vec{L}_q^{NR} - \vec{L}_{\bar{q}}^{NR} \right) \\
& + \sum_q \frac{Q_q}{\langle k_0 \rangle_q} \left(1 - \frac{m_q}{2 (\langle k_0 \rangle_q + m_q)} \right) (\vec{S}_q - \vec{S}_{\bar{q}}) + \sum_q \frac{Q_q}{2 (\langle k_0 \rangle_q + m_q)} \frac{1}{2} \vec{\delta} q \\
& + \sum_{q\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \frac{Q_q}{2k_0} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^\dagger i \vec{\partial}_k b_{q-\vec{k}\lambda'}^\dagger \times \chi_\lambda^\dagger \left(m_q \vec{\sigma} + \frac{\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k}}{k_0 + m_q} i \vec{\sigma} \times \vec{k} \right) \chi_{\lambda'} + h.c.,
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $\vec{L}_q^{NR}$ and $\vec{L}_{\bar{q}}^{NR}$ correspond to the derivative terms in the expression of $\vec{L}q$ in eq.(9) and can be recognized as “nonrelativistic” orbital angular momentum in nonrelativistic quark models. For ground state baryons, it is plausible to assume $L_q^{NR}(L_{\bar{q}}^{NR}) = 0$, as in most quark models. In contrast, as can be seen from eq.(9), the “relativistic” orbital angular momentum L_q and $L_{\bar{q}}$ will not be zero even for pure s -wave state. And the $\frac{1}{2}\vec{\delta}q$ term in eq.(15) is just the “trace” left by such “relativistic” orbital contribution.

The quark-antiquark pair creation (annihilation) terms only contribute when different Fock components mixing is taken into account. A constituent quark model with valence q^3 and sea $q^3 q\bar{q}$ mixing has been used to estimate the contribution of such terms to magnetic moment, and it is found to be small ($-0.065\mu_P$ for proton) [5]. With the assumptions:

$$\begin{aligned}
L_q^{NR} &= L_{\bar{q}}^{NR} = 0 \\
\text{Fock components mixing contributions negligible,}
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

eq.(15) reduces to

$$\vec{\mu} = \sum_q \frac{Q_q}{\langle k_0 \rangle_q} \left[\left(1 - \frac{m_q}{2 (\langle k_0 \rangle_q + m_q)} \right) (\vec{S}_q - \vec{S}_{\bar{q}}) + \frac{\langle k_0 \rangle_q}{2 (\langle k_0 \rangle_q + m_q)} \frac{1}{2} \vec{\delta} q \right]. \tag{17}$$

Or equivalently,

$$\mu_B = \sum_q \frac{Q_q}{2 \langle k_0 \rangle_q} \left[\left(1 - \frac{m_q}{2 (\langle k_0 \rangle_q + m_q)} \right) (\Delta_q - \Delta_{\bar{q}}) + \frac{\langle k_0 \rangle_q}{\langle k_0 \rangle_q + m_q} \frac{1}{2} \delta q \right]. \tag{18}$$

This is a good expression to work with, for it expresses baryon magnetic moment through baryon tensor charge and quark (antiquark) contribution to baryon spin, which are all planned to be measured experimentally. By assuming SU(3) flavor symmetry among the octet baryons, their magnetic moments can be expressed in terms of the spin contents of the proton [2,3]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_P &= \frac{2e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_u} W_u + \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_d} W_d + \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_s} W_s, \\
\mu_n &= \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_d} W_u + \frac{2e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_u} W_d + \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_s} W_s, \\
\mu_{\Sigma^+} &= \frac{2e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_u} W_u + \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_s} W_d + \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_d} W_s, \\
\mu_{\Sigma^-} &= \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_d} W_u + \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_s} W_d + \frac{2e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_u} W_s, \\
\mu_{\Xi^0} &= \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_s} W_u + \frac{2e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_u} W_d + \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_d} W_s, \\
\mu_{\Xi^-} &= \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_s} W_u + \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_d} W_d + \frac{2e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_u} W_s, \\
\mu_\Lambda &= \frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{2e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_u} + \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_d} \right) (W_u + 4W_d + W_s) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{6} \cdot \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_s} (4W_u - 2W_d + 4W_s), \\
\mu_{\Sigma\Lambda} &= \frac{-1}{2\sqrt{6}} \left(\frac{2e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_u} - \frac{-e}{6 \langle k_0 \rangle_d} \right) (W_u - 2W_d + W_s).
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where

$$W_q = \left(1 - \frac{m_q}{2(\langle k_0 \rangle_q + m_q)}\right) (\Delta_q - \Delta_{\bar{q}}) + \frac{\langle k_0 \rangle_q}{\langle k_0 \rangle_q + m_q} \frac{1}{2} \delta q, \quad (20)$$

and Δ_q , $\Delta_{\bar{q}}$ etc. all refer to the quantities of the proton.

With the measurements of Δ_q , $\Delta_{\bar{q}}$ and δq , and together with the existing experimental values of baryon magnetic moments, eqs.(19) and (20) will provide a check of the assumptions in eq.(16) and also of the SU(3) flavor symmetry.

Now let's go back to look at nonrelativistic constituent quark model. For the first thing, as was noticed historically [6], and as we made explicitly in eqs.(5), (10), (15) etc., it is not the static quark mass but the relativistic quark energy inside the baryon that determines the quark contribution to baryon magnetic moment. Due to confinement, quark kinetic energy inside the baryon is rather high (an estimation with the uncertainty relation shows that it is about 300MeV). This explains why constituent quark model can reproduce baryon magnetic moment by adopting a large constituent quark mass. (There are also discussions on other mechanisms of producing a large effective constituent quark mass, such as from chiral symmetry breaking in chiral quark models [7].)

On the other hand, following the same steps as that lead to eq.(18), we can obtain a parameterization of baryon magnetic moment similar to that in nonrelativistic constituent quark model:

$$\mu_B = \sum_q \frac{Q_q}{2\langle k_0 \rangle_q} \left[\left(1 + \frac{m_q}{2\langle k_0 \rangle_q}\right) (\Delta_q^{NR} - \Delta_{\bar{q}}^{NR}) - \frac{1}{2} (\delta_q - \delta_{\bar{q}}) \right] \quad (21)$$

$$= \sum_q \frac{Q_q}{2\langle k_0 \rangle_q} \left(1 + \frac{m_q}{2\langle k_0 \rangle_q} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta_q - \delta_{\bar{q}}}{\Delta_q^{NR} - \Delta_{\bar{q}}^{NR}}\right) (\Delta_q^{NR} - \Delta_{\bar{q}}^{NR}) \quad (22)$$

$$\equiv \sum_q \frac{Q_q}{2m_q^{eff}} (\Delta_q^{NR} - \Delta_{\bar{q}}^{NR}) \quad (23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_q^{NR} &= \left\langle PS \left| \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \chi_\lambda^\dagger \sigma_3 \chi_{\lambda'} a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^\dagger a_{q\vec{k}\lambda'} \right| PS \right\rangle, \\ \Delta_{\bar{q}}^{NR} &= \left\langle PS \left| - \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \chi_\lambda^\dagger \sigma_3 \chi_{\lambda'} b_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^\dagger b_{q\vec{k}\lambda'} \right| PS \right\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

correspond to the quark (antiquark) spin in nonrelativistic quark models, and we have defined the factor times $\frac{1}{2}Q_q (\Delta_q^{NR} - \Delta_{\bar{q}}^{NR})$ as the reciprocal of an ‘‘effective’’ constituent quark mass. In the absence of relativistic corrections and antiquark polarization, $(\delta_q - \delta_{\bar{q}})$ equals $(\Delta_q^{NR} - \Delta_{\bar{q}}^{NR})$, and hence m_q^{eff} is proportional to $\langle k_0 \rangle_q$. Preliminary experimental results show that antiquark polarization inside the nucleon is rather small [8]. And from an alternative expression of tensor charge

$$\vec{\delta}q = \sum_{\lambda\lambda'} \int d^3k \chi_\lambda^\dagger \left(\vec{\sigma} - \frac{(\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k})\vec{k}}{k_0(k_0 + m)} \right) \chi_{\lambda'} \left(a_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^\dagger a_{q\vec{k}\lambda'} + b_{q\vec{k}\lambda}^\dagger b_{q\vec{k}\lambda'} \right) + \text{pair terms}, \quad (25)$$

we see that the relativistic correction of tensor charge (the $(\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k})\vec{k}$ term) is roughly of the order $k_3^2/k_0^2 \approx 1/3$ for light quarks. Therefore we see from eqs. (22) and (23) that m_q^{eff} is proportional to $\langle k_0 \rangle_q$ within the error of 1/6. This finishes our analyses of why nonrelativistic constituent quark models can explain baryon magnetic moment better than 20%, by using the simple expression of eq.(23) and adopting only two parameters of constituent quark masses.

To end up our discussions, we must stress that through out this paper we have not paid any attention to whether a baryon could be approximated as several constituent quarks at low energy. What we have provided for nonrelativistic constituent quark model is a justification of its simple magnetic-moment-spin relation as in eq.(23), which is the *essential* of its success at the magnetic moment problem. Eq.(23) will hold (within the error of 1/6 and with m_q^{eff} roughly of the order of constituent quark mass) no matter how complicated the actual structure of the baryon is, and no matter whether there is really the picture of constituent quarks inside the baryon at all.

We thank Bo-Qiang Ma and Hanxin He for helpful discussions. This work is supported in part by NSFC(19675018), SEDC and SSTC of China.

- [1] EMC, J. Ashman *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **206** (1988) 364; Nucl. Phys. **B328** (1989) 1.
U. Stiegler, Phys. Rep. **277** (1996) 1.
- [2] G. Karl, Phys. Rev. D **45** (1992) 247.
- [3] T.P. Cheng and L.F. Li, Phys. Lett. B **366** (1996) 365.
- [4] R.L. Jaffe and X. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 552; Nucl. Phys. **B375** (1992) 527.
- [5] D. Qing, X.S. Chen and F. Wang, Phys. Rev. C **57** (1998) R31.
- [6] See, eg., J. Franklin, Phys. Rev. **172** (1968) 1807; and references therein.
- [7] A. Manohar and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. **B234** (1984) 189.
- [8] SMC, B. Adeva *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **369** (1996) 93.